

REMARKS

Claims 75-81 and 83-133 are now pending in the patent application.

The 35 USC §101 Rejection

The independent claims are rejected under 35 USC §101 as failing to recite statutory subject matter.

Claim 75 is amended to recite a method comprising: storing a signal containing information about an active ticket in a mobile terminal for use by a mobile terminal user, said signal also containing information about a ticket multimedia validation feature of the active ticket provided by the mobile terminal, for indicating a validation status of the active ticket; receiving in the mobile terminal a control signal from a ticket service provider; and in response to the received control signal, dynamically changing in the signal the information about the ticket multimedia validation feature of the active ticket provided by the mobile terminal, for indicating a change in the validation status of the active ticket, wherein said ticket multimedia validation feature comprises multimedia data being provided for an active ticket verification of the mobile terminal by a ticket inspector. In claim 75, the language of subparagraph 1 and 3 now also read consistent with one another.

The amendment to claim 75 makes clear that the signal being stored contains information about an active ticket in a mobile terminal for use by a mobile terminal user, and also contains information about a ticket multimedia validation feature of the active ticket provided by the mobile terminal, for

indicating a validation status of the active ticket, and that this information is dynamically changed in response to a received control signal.

In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that the dynamic changing of the information in this signal transform the signal to a different state, consistent with the statutory requirements of 35 USC section 101, and the accompanying case law.

The other independent claims are amended to contain similar limitations and are deemed to recite statutory subject matter for all the same reasons.

The 35 USC §112 Rejection

The claims are rejected under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite.

The claims are amended in view of the points raise by the Examiner.

The other independent claims are amended to contain similar limitations and are also deemed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention for all the same reasons.

The 35 USC §103 Rejection

Claims 75-133 are rejected based on a proposed combination of Lee in view of Izumoto and Yu, which is a newly cited reference in the proposed combination for disclosing multimedia data for being used for active ticket verification by an inspector.

To the extent that the rejection might be applied to the main independent claims, as amended, it is respectfully traversed because the cited three reference prior art combination does not disclose, teach or suggest, in response to a control signal received in a mobile terminal from a ticket service provider, dynamically changing in a signal containing information about an ticket multimedia validation feature of an active ticket provided by a mobile terminal, for indicating a change in a validation status of the active ticket, wherein the ticket multimedia validation feature comprises multimedia data being provided for an active ticket verification of the mobile terminal by a ticket inspector, as claimed.

For example, Lee discloses a technique for providing and changing an e-ticket using an IC card reader/recorder 40, IC card 13 and ticket dispenser 30 that issues a physical paper ticket 14. Lee's technique is missing a couple of key limitations of the claimed invention.

First, Lee does not disclose, teach or suggest storing a signal containing information about an active ticket in a mobile terminal for use by a mobile terminal user, said signal also containing information about a ticket multimedia validation feature of the active ticket provided by the mobile

terminal, for indicating a validation status of the active ticket, as claimed. Instead, Lee's ticket information is merely stored on an IC card 13 and printed out on the paper ticket 14, consistent with that described in paragraphs 38-39 being cited in the reasoning in section 8 of the office action.

Second, Lee does not disclose, teach or suggest receiving in the mobile terminal a control signal from a ticket service provider; and dynamically changing in the signal the information about the ticket multimedia validation feature of the active ticket provided by the mobile terminal, for indicating a change in the validation status of the active ticket, wherein said ticket multimedia validation feature comprises multimedia data being provided for an active ticket verification of the mobile terminal by a ticket inspector. Instead, Lee's change to the ticket information is merely stored on an IC card 13, printed out as a new physical paper ticket 14, and provided for an active ticket verification by a ticket inspector.

Izumoto discloses a technique that is similar to Lee's in that it too uses an IC card reader/writer 1, a ticket gate terminal 4 and an IC card reader 5 shown in Figure 1. In Izumoto, the IC card itself is provided and verified at a ticket gate terminal 4 (Figure 1) to determine whether a user may enter (See Izumoto, paragraph 107). Moreover, Izumoto's IC card is not such an active ticket having such a ticket multimedia validation feature that may be dynamically changed in response to a control signal received in a mobile terminal, as claimed. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that Izumoto does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies in Lee.

In the most recent office action, Yu is now being cited for disclosing multimedia data for being used for active ticket verification by an inspector. Yu discloses a technique for provisioning an electronic ticket that can be displayed by a portable computing device 10 as a bar code 12 for a ticket 14. However, similar to Lee and Izumoto, Yu does not disclose, teach or suggest receiving in a mobile terminal a control signal from a ticket service provider; then dynamically changing in a signal being stored containing information about a ticket multimedia validation feature of an active ticket provided by the mobile terminal, for indicating a change in the validation status of the active ticket, wherein said ticket multimedia validation feature comprises multimedia data being provided for an active ticket verification of the mobile terminal by a ticket inspector. For example, it is respectfully submitted that Yu does not receive a control signal for dynamically changing the validation status of its bar code 12 of its ticket 14 being provided for an active ticket verification of the portable computing device 10 by a ticket inspector.

The other independent claims contain similar limitations.

The remaining claims depend directly or indirectly from the main independent claims, contain all the limitations thereof, and are deemed patentable for all the same reasons.

* * *

Reconsideration and early allowance are respectfully requested.

13 January 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/William J. Barber/

William J. Barber
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No. 32,720

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Customer No. 004955
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 261-1234